

REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 16-19 and new claims 20-22 are now in this application. Claims 10-13 are allowed. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 14 and 15 are rejected. Claim 15 is cancelled herein. Claims 7 and 16-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 14 and 16-19 are amended herein to clarify the invention, to broaden language as deemed appropriate and to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

Allowable Subject Matter

In view of the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 16-19, these claims are rewritten in independent form, i.e., each is amended to include the subject matter of original independent claim 15. As such, claims 16-19 should be allowable over the prior art of record.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because the limitation "the time series" lacks antecedent basis.

Claims 1 and 5 are amended to remove the limitation of "the time series" and claim 17 is amended to positively recite "a time series".

In view of the changes to claims 1, 5 and 17, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 5 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, has been overcome and should be removed.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Coiner et al. reference (U.S. Pat. No. 5,638,273).

The Examiner's rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8 and 14 is respectfully traversed in view of changes to independent claims 1, 5, 6 and 14.

Specifically, claims 1 and 5 are amended to include the feature of means for analyzing an operation tendency of a mobile object based on information recorded on a storage medium. Claim 1 is also amended to clarify that the condition setting means set the collecting condition onto the storage medium in accordance with mobile object operation factors different from each other. Claim 5 is also amended to recite that the predetermined storage medium contains a predetermined collecting condition.

Claim 6 is amended to include the feature of recording means for determining the presence or absence of occurrence of a specific behavior in the behavior of a mobile object and for recording information relating thereto on a storage medium onto which the behavioral condition has been set to thereby enable analysis of an

operation tendency of the mobile object based on information recorded on a storage medium.

In the invention, a predetermined storage medium such as a memory card 20 is programmed by a behavior analyzer 30 with collecting conditions so that when the memory card 20 is removed from engagement with the behavior analyzer 30 and connected to a data recorder 10, the data recorder 10 reads the collecting condition and obtains information about operation of a mobile object which satisfy the collecting condition. Specifically, as noted at page 14, lines 12-18 of the specification, the reading unit 133 of the data recorder 20 recognizes the condition pattern recorded on the memory card 20. The event extracting unit 132 of the data recorder 10 then extracts measured data compatible with the condition pattern (see page 14, lines 19-24). Thus, in the invention, the data recorder 10 is designed to obtain information relating to the specific collecting conditions set on the storage medium and when the memory card 20 is detached from the data recorder 10 and connected again to the behavior analyzer 30, the behavior analyzer 30 analyzes an operation tendency of the mobile object based on the information recorded on the memory card 20.

Coiner et al. describes a system for monitoring, recording and analyzing operational and incident data from a motor vehicle. Operational data is stored at one frequency in the absence of an incident or triggering event and stored at a second, higher frequency surrounding the incident or triggering event.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments of the invention, Coiner et al. does not disclose setting collecting conditions for data on a storage medium and analyzing an operation tendency of the mobile object based on information recorded on the storage medium. Rather, the only collecting conditions are programmed into the data recorder to vary the frequency of collection of the data and are not set on a storage medium by a behavior analyzer. Therefore, Coiner et al. cannot anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the invention set forth in independent claims 1, 5 and 6 or in claims 2, 3 and 8 which depend from one of these claims.

With respect to claim 14, this claim is amended to include the feature of a first collecting condition for collecting information relating to dangerous behavior of a mobile object and a second collecting condition for collecting information relating to normal behavior other than dangerous behavior being set on a storage medium.

Coiner et al. does not disclose setting multiple collecting conditions on a storage medium and which collecting conditions are used to determine which data is stored on the storage medium. Moreover, Coiner et al. does not disclose collecting information relating to dangerous behavior as specific behavior and recording this information on a predetermined storage medium, reading the recorded information and analyzing the behavioral content of the mobile object from the read information. Therefore, Coiner et al. cannot anticipate or render obvious the embodiment of the invention set forth in independent claim 14.

With respect to claim 15, this claim is cancelled so the rejection of this claim has been rendered moot.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Coiner et al. reference in view of the Graf et al. reference (U.S. Pat. No. 6,311,114). The Examiner takes a position that it would have been obvious to incorporate driver behavior and identification of a system controller as disclosed in the Graf et al. reference in the data storage and analysis features of the Coiner et al. system.

Graf et al. does not disclose setting collecting conditions for data on a storage medium and analyzing an operation tendency of the mobile object based on information recorded on the storage medium, which features are set forth in claims 1 and 6 upon which claims 4 and 9 depend respectively. Therefore, one could not combine Coiner et al. and Graf et al. and arrive at the embodiments of claims 4 and 9.

New Claims

Claims 20-22 are added. Claim 20 is directed to the feature of the storage medium being a memory card detachably connected to the data recorder. Claim 21 is directed to a feature previously set forth in claim 1. Claim 22 is directed to the

feature of the analyzing means, i.e., the behavior analyzer, being separate and apart from the data recorder.

One claim in excess of twenty is added. Three further independent claims in excess of three are added. Accordingly, please charge the fee of \$138 to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Applicant respectfully requests a three month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. Please charge the fee of \$475 for the extension of time to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg by Brunoff
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 35336

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340